



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/665,258

09/22/2003

Thomas Goering

11884-400301

7117

23838 7590 01/12/2007
KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PURCELL, IAN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

01/12/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/665,258	Applicant(s) GOERING, THOMAS	
	Examiner Ian M. Purcell	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Menninger (“Menninger”, US # 2003/0048301).

3. As per independent claim 1, Menninger teaches a computer system for customizing form elements in a form building application (page 81, paragraph [1858]), comprising:

a form builder component configured to receive an identification of a user of the form building application (page 35, paragraph [0715]), the form building application providing a graphical user interface for the manipulation of a set of form elements (page 81, paragraph [1858]), and to enable access to a subset of the form elements according to authorization rules (page 25, paragraphs [0544] and [0547]; page 47, paragraphs [1107] and [1116]; and page 46, paragraphs [1078] – page 47, paragraph [1085]); and

an access manager component configured to determine the authorization rules associated with the user (page 46, paragraph [1080] – page 47, paragraph [1085]).

Independent claim 5 is similar in scope to independent claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. As per claim 2, Menninger teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the identification of the user is based on login information (page 35, paragraphs [0714]-[0176]).

Claim 6 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. As per claim 3, Menninger teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the authorization rules are determined via a lookup table associating the user identification with the authorization rules for the user (page 32, paragraph [0655]; and page 65, paragraph [1537] and table 26).

Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. As per claim 4, Menninger teaches the system of claim 3, wherein the authorization rules include settings that identify the subset of the form elements which are viewable and/or changeable (page 25, paragraphs [0544] and [0547]; page 47, paragraphs [1107] and [1116]; and page 46, paragraphs [1078] – page 47, paragraph [1085]).

Claim 8 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menninger ("Menninger", US # 2003/0048301) in view of Chen et al ("Chen", US # 2003/0020746 A1).

9. As per independent claim 9, Menninger teaches a computer-implemented method for customizing an electronic form (page 81, paragraph [1858]), comprising:

responsive to a command by a user to change an element of the form (page 81, paragraph [1858]), retrieving a permission list from a lookup table (page 32, paragraph [0655]; and page 65, paragraph [1537] and table 26);

rejecting the command unless the access rights associated with the user's identifier permit the user to change the form element (page 61, Table 21, *deny access to applications*).

However Menninger does not teach expressly the method comprising:

the permission list identifying access rights for a plurality of form elements contained in the form; and

comparing an identifier associated with the user to those the access rights for the form element to be changed.

Chen teaches a method for generating a webpage comprising:

responsive to a command by a user to change an element of the form (Abstract), the permission list identifying access rights for a plurality of form elements contained in the form (page 1, paragraph [0010]); and

comparing an identifier associated with the user to those the access rights for the form element to be changed (claim 1).

Menninger and Chen are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor, namely managing access rights within graphical user interfaces.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the functions as taught by Chen into Menninger's method for editing information in order to provide a more fine-grained access control.

Art Unit: 2174

10. As per claim 10, the modified Menninger, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein the command by the user to change the form element includes selecting in a form building application a node representing the form element (Chen, Figure 2).

11. As per claim 11, the modified Menninger, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein the access rights are defined for form elements representing a form's corporate identity (page 29, paragraph [0624] – page 30 Table 3).

12. As per claim 12, the modified Menninger, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein the access rights are defined for form elements representing a form's interface to an application program (Menninger, page 61, Table 21, *deny access to applications*).

13. As per claim 13, the modified Menninger, teaches the method of claim 9, wherein the access rights are defined based on at least one of user id (Menninger, page 35, paragraph [0715]), job title (fig. 63), department code and position in the corporate hierarchy (page 44, paragraphs [0991] – [0997]).

Conclusion

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ian M. Purcell whose telephone number is (571) 272-5755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ian M. Purcell
Examiner

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100